

7627 Old Receiver Road
Frederick MD 21702

June 27, 1991

Ms. Jane Rusconi
Research Coordinator
Camelot Productions Corporation
512 S. Peters St. - Suite 202
New Orleans LA 70130

Dear Ms. Rusconi:

The Mighty Mountain has labored and labored and labored and finally his little mouse squeaks for him.

Your letter of the 17th, not mailed until the 25th, came today. As a contribution to the record I leave for history, I welcome it. In its self-serving misrepresentations, it is typical of the Mighty Mountain's slack-jaw, front and back, reflected in clippings people are sending me. Except for what it reveals of all of you and what you are doing, it has no value and it certainly does not address anything I said, including the basic premise that anything based on Garrison begins with overt dishonesty and, after being notified, continues as intended dishonesty.

The first sentence in your last paragraph is, "If it is at all possible, we'd like to salvage something constructive out of this relationship."

"Constructive" - with what you are doing? Impossible!

What "relationship"? Certainly none at all with the Important Person whose time is reserved for nuts and sycophants, from whom I've not heard a word. Unless you have in mind your call from Dallas in which you asked if he could call the next day, I said certainly, and his next day hasn't come yet. Or do you mean that call and this self-serving nonsense of yours constitutes some kind of relationship?

Aside from all else that is so very wrong with the rest of this paragraph, you conclude, "what can we do to make the best of our [sic] situation," meaning "short of dramatizing the 250,000 pages you've wrested from the Archives."

Come to think of it, I rather like what I missed on first reading, your personal reflection of the basic ignorance of fact that permeates all that all of you are up to, in this instance by and a self-characterization of the "research coordinator."

Those 250,000 pages, meaning that part of about a third of a million pages that relate to the JFK assassination investigation, came almost entirely from other than the Archives. By far the greatest number of pages of the small percentage of them I got by suing the Archives are of the Commission's

executive session transcripts that, as a reflection of the genuineness of your letter, I remind you I offered you when you phoned, with an explanation of why I was calling them to your attention.

Neither now nor at any time in the past have I had any interest in personal attention, either for myself or for all those pages and all that goes with them. Not even when I gave it all away for a permanent public archive, with no quid pro quo. Unlike those of you who live by other standards and have other interests, it is enough for me to look back on 78 years and believe that in the miles we all go before we sleep I have been able to keep some of those promises of which Frost wrote.

The last thing I now want is any kind of relationship with the obscenity of which you are part. In his time and ways, Garrison did more than anyone else to undermine the credibility of all criticism of the official mythology. What you are involved in will greatly magnify the harm he did, the credibility he gave official miscreants.

It may seem strange to you, as anything honest should given your present occupation and function, that I do try to live by principles. One is that I permit access to others to the records I obtained by FOIA litigation. I consider that FOIA makes me surrogate for the people and, to the degree now possible for me, I try to do that. Most of the many who have used these records have made it clear that what they will use them for is what I disagree with. But in no case have I denied access and I can't deny you (plural) access and be consistent with what has been my undeviating practice.

This does not include my own work or any uses I have made of those records.

They are all filed as I received them except that each volume is now in a folder that identifies it and all the file cabinets are labeled to identify the records each holds.

Your second paragraph is more freshman-like than sophomore and, save for one thing, is not worth any time. What George Lardner wrote was not "willfully sloppy journalism."

With regard to that back-room conspiracy jazz in stories I've been sent, it was not he, also referred to as a CIA front or stooge (doesn't that make me one, too?), who got in touch with me about the indecency from which you are currently getting your paycheck. It was I who got in touch with him and his was the first such story. I know of nothing sloppy in that story. Nor do I recall even a minor inaccuracy. As you know from the unidentified letter to which you pretend to respond but do not in any honest way.

With regard to your third paragraph, I have always believed and believe I have always said that the assassination of any president has the effect of a coup d'etat. The thrust of all my writing is that the government did not investigate the crime itself and never intended to. If your film were not based on the scrapings of the intellectual sewers, you would be aware of the extensive documentation available on this.

Then comes the greasy kid stuff: "But a cover-up is the third stage of a

conspiracy - it has to follow the planning and the actual murder act."

Before all your critical faculties were nullified by your required dependence on Garrison's inventions, did you graduate high school with this kind of reasoning?

What you are actually saying is that, when the police claim to have solved any murder they have not solved, they are the murderers. Do they not "follow the planning and the actual murder act"?

That there was a conspiracy does not per se identify any of the conspirators.

The thinking you reflect is that because a jury, most of whom believed there had been a conspiracy, rejected Garrison's fabrications as entirely without merit in less than an hour, it therefore is entirely dependable, truthful, honest, factual and worth being taken to the people so they can know what really did happen!

You can't even decently or honestly pretend to establish that there was a conspiracy from Garrison's ravings, even when they are low-keyed. Even when amplified by those of Marrs. Or anyone else's.

In your fourth paragraph you say that you (plural) and I agree on some things. That is not relevant. What is relevant is why each of us believes those things. The difference is between a cheap penny-dreadful and fact. You disdain fact and have none.

You also say that "the story needs to be told to as many people as possible..." What story? All the nutty and irresponsible, unproven and unprovable theories you can get from the most disreputable commercializations and exploitations, ranging from Garrison's, about whom I provided more than enough in my first letter, to Marrs' who is less likely to be terribly wrong when, as he has in samples sent to me, cribbed word for word, paragraph after paragraph - the man to whom fact is a stranger and truth an insult?

Nor can you get it from those assassination zanies you have hired as experts.

One of them even boasts that he has never read any book on the assassination.

The sad truth is that this makes him less dependable than those whose work you use.

He has only verbal nonsense he alchemizes into fact simply because it is appealing to him. He is not contaminated by all those many wrong-headed printed words of inventions of "solutions."

Despite the present attempts to weasel and withdraw what was said earlier to promote this disgrace while simultaneously promoting the one then just released, this was represented as a faithful account of our "history" in which the people would be told "who" killed our President, "why" and "how." As recently as the Baron interview in Lagniappe, the one qualification added to these very words was "we think" before one of those repeated claims.

There is no limit to what can be said as fiction. You can do the most wretchedly

miserable trash you want and still say it is dedicated to your "love" of the martyr and you have that right. You (plural) abandon that right with the claims already made and are not now for self-convenience subject to withdrawal.

In simple words, you cannot "make the people want to know the truth"-and by all the measurements we have, they have no such need, have always had this desire - by giving them lies, fabrications and theories that are not and cannot be proven as the truth, as "history."

You will, without question, deceive, mislead and impose upon the trust of more people on this than first the Warren Commission and then Jim Garrison did.


It is not a sow's ear of which you say you are making a pearl.

Nothing from any pig can do that.

Too bad you could not use the Giesebrecht fabrication you were interested in, as one of your correspondents told me you regretted.

That it comes from the National Enquirer means you would have had to reach too high to get it anyway.

Sincerely,


Harold Weisberg

Rozoni ltr 6/17/91
&
reply

Rozoni ltr of 6/17/91
& reply
